

we needed at least 44 interceptors, and as you go through the war colleges here in the area, nearly always when they go through their scenarios, they say we need even more than the 44. But now all of the sudden—and we only have 26 actually now. We're capped at a number of 30. Now all of a sudden we're going to cap it at 30, and I think that's very dangerous. Because keep in mind, this is not just one interceptor per incoming missile. We want to do everything that we can to have some redundancy where we sometimes shoot three and perhaps even four to one where if we have one missile coming in, we want to make sure we get as many shots off as possible to make sure one doesn't land. Because if a nuclear missile lands in one of your cities, it will ruin your whole day.

Mr. AKIN. No doubt about that. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If I can go back, though, I want to make this a little bit worse than it is, because not only is this program capped at 30 when we need at least 44, the KEI, kinetic energy interceptor, a program where the contracts were let only in 2003, they have gone through seven static tests. In fact, they are on the launch site and ready to do the first flight tests, and the Secretary of Defense has decided to cancel that program, even though the admiral in charge of the Chiefs of Staff says we need more research and development.

This is a remarkable idea to try and catch these missiles coming at us at a different stage in the game, where with the technology that is being developed, it's working, it has been successful in the static tests. We should at least go forward and see how far this program can go. But this program has also been chopped, and at the same time, the old traditional defense of the Minuteman 3 has been stopped and capped. We will no longer refurbish or rebuild these particular rockets.

And indeed, what is scary to me is the Russians have already said they are going to rebuild and redo their ICBM projects so that by 2018, 80 percent of their ICBMs are going to be brand new with new capability, and we do not have the capability in our defense budget to actually meet any of that future need which may be there.

Mr. AKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. The gentleman is correct on a number of different points. Once we don't build those, not only are they not there for the defense capabilities, but we also eventually lose our industrial base to build them at all. We can't just go out in the street and find someone on the sidewalk and say come on, we would like to build a missile defense capability; we'd like to have you come in and be one of our rocket scientists. It takes a great deal of time and energy to have that industrial base which is in place now, and I think we make a terrible mistake.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, let's take a look at what this budget is doing because the gentleman from Utah has brought up some good points.

What's happened is the Democrats are basically cutting component parts of missile defense. They know it works. They have seen the tests. They know the stuff works. They can't say it doesn't work, but they are not going to fund it. They're funding some of it, but they're not funding some of the key programs that are important.

The first thing they're cutting is the number of what's called ground-based missiles. Those are the ones, if you think about a missile and how far it can go, the missiles that go the farthest, we call them intercontinental ballistic missiles, and those missiles, the only way you stop them is with that ground-based defense. And so we're going to freeze the number of those ground-based defenses, but that's not all that we're cutting.

What we're also going to do is, we're going to stop the kinetic kill. Is that in the reentry aspect? Is that what that was for, or is that a different part?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. No, sir. The KEI is an extremely fast missile, and it was made to intercept other missiles in the boost phase, and the airborne laser and KEI were our only boost phase systems, and both of those have been cut precipitously, and that's the most important place to try to interdict a missile because it's moving slower. There are no countermeasures. There are no decoys deployed, and of course, if you have an impact, then the fratricide falls back upon the offending Nation. So this is the most important phase that we could ever attack or intercept an enemy missile, and we're essentially doing away with both of those programs, leaving only the ABL in place as an experiment, as a research project.

Mr. AKIN. So what's happening, though, are they cutting the funding for the airborne laser, also?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. The airborne laser has been cut precipitously and is now essentially a research project, rather than a deployable future system.

Mr. AKIN. So, in other words, what we're doing is we've got the three stages where you can shoot at a missile: when the missile is being launched, which is in some ways the place where the missile is most vulnerable and where you turn it into junk, it falls on the country that launched it at you. Then you've got the mid-course and we're limiting that. And then you've got the reentry part of it. So what you're saying is we're doing some serious cuts in all of those areas.

And so here you have Iran just this morning launches this, and their technology is moving fast, moved to solid rocket, multiple stage. They're busy putting the centrifuges together to make the nuclear devices. Let's take a look at what a range of 1,200 miles would mean.

Here from Iran, as you come out in these circles, what you are saying is,

first of all, you can hit all of Israel, and second of all, you can threaten sort of the southwest part of Europe with that range missile. Is that correct, gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. That is correct, and of course, the other irony here is that there's really only one payload that makes any sense to put on a missile like that, and that's a nuclear warhead. The other applications don't make a lot of sense.

Mr. AKIN. And yet our President has negotiated away, from what we know, putting the radar that we need and the battery of missiles to protect Europe and eastern United States.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, that's correct, and of course, to try to make the rhetoric they say, well, there are other mechanisms that we have potentially to defend Europe, which may be a land-based SM-3 system with the augment of Aegis, but there are two things wrong with that. Number one, it's more than twice as expensive to do that, and number two, those systems do not protect the homeland of the United States against any ICBM from Iran.

Mr. AKIN. I'm going to reluctantly recognize the gentleman from Utah. He's been bringing a lot of bad news tonight, but still I guess we better know what the truth is.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate that, and I'm sorry to be the downer in this party night. This is one of the ironies. Not only did the Iranians launch something today, but when the administration announced their budget cuts for the missile defense program, on the very day, 7,000 miles away, North Korea's Kim Jong Il was shooting another missile. Now, admittedly this one landed in the Sea of Japan, but it threatens Japan and it was on a trajectory toward the United States. They are not backing down, and they're not backing off, and I want to put in perspective what we're talking about because all of the discussion we've heard so far is these are very expensive programs, we may not be able to afford them.

The entire savings for these programs in 2010 is \$1.7 billion, roughly. Now, that sounds like a whole lot of money, until you remember on our stimulus bill we spent \$800 billion, supposedly to create jobs we're now cutting here. And what's even worse in that bill is \$5 billion for government organizations like ACORN. Now, I'm sorry, that's not my priority list.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, now you're stopping the preaching and getting on to meddling.

What you're saying is in the first five weeks that this Congress met, we passed this porkulous bill or stimulus bill or whatever you want to call it at \$800-something billion, and you're talking about cutting missile defense by less than \$2 billion. Did I understand the number correctly?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That's what I said.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. The total missile defense budget, in total, is less